

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-21 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 9, 15, and 19 are independent. In the Office Action dated March 27, 2006, Claims 14 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, and Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Following this response, Claims 1-21 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second paragraph

In the Office Action dated March 27, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Patent Act requires that through the patent claims, an applicant must particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which he regards as his invention. (See 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph) The test for whether a claim meets the definiteness requirement is "whether those skilled in the art would understand what is claimed when the claim is read in light of the specification." (See MPEP 2173.02, sixth paragraph and *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 806 F.2d 1565, 1576, 1 USPQ2d 1081, 1088 (Fed. Cir. 1986).) Because the specification at least sets forth, for example, "the solution specification file 38 may include an XML tag, or other type of identifier, that instructs the WPA 34 to include

the property value for one or more server properties in the rendered Web page 26,” one skilled in the art is able to ascertain the meaning of the term “solution specific file” from this example. (See specification page 12, lines 25-28.) Consequently, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection Claims 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0124007 (“Zhao”). Regarding Claims 1-14 and 19-21, Claims 1, 9, and 19 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter. Regarding Claims 15-18, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Support for these amendments may be found in the specification at least on page 11, lines 6-13.

Regarding Claims 1-14 and 19-21 amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for, at least for the reason that it recites, for example, “retrieving the current value of the property, wherein retrieving the current value comprises identifying a location of the property from an Extensible Markup Language (XML) map.” Amended Claims 9 and 19 each includes a similar recitation.

Consistent with an embodiment of the invention, a request may be received at a Web server application 32 for a Web page 26. The Web server application 32 recognizes that the Web page 26 includes a reference to a Web part assembly (WPA) 34. (See specification, page 11, lines 6-8.) Accordingly, the Web server

application 32 may pass the request to the WPA 34. (See specification, page 11, lines 8-9.) The WPA 34 may then determine, based on Web part properties 36, a location of a solution specification file 38 associated with a Web part object 28A. (See specification, page 11, lines 9-11.) The solution specification file may include a pointer to an Extensible Markup Language (XML) map 40. (See specification, page 11, lines 11-12.) The XML map 40 may be utilized by the Web part object 28A when executing on a client computer 2 to locate, retrieve, and format data. (See specification, page 11, lines 12-13.)

In contrast, *Zhao* at least does not disclose the aforementioned recitation from Claim 1. For example, *Zhao* merely discloses a device property table 50 in database 30 of network server 20. Device property table 50 represents device property table 35A in database 30 for characterizing intelligent device 15A. (See paragraph [0041].) For example, if intelligent device 15A is a color television, in *Zhao*, the associated objects may include television channel frequencies, brightness, color, tint, and volume. (See paragraph [0041].) In addition, in *Zhao*, an object property table 60 in database 30 of network server 20 describes an object associated with intelligent device 15A in Intranet 16. (See paragraph [0044].)

Furthermore, in *Zhao*, device property table 35A with corresponding object property tables A1-Ai in database 20 is projected from respective intelligent device 15A. (See paragraph [0057].) When network server 20 is connected to intelligent device 15A the device property table and object property tables in intelligent device 15A are periodically projected into database layer 26 of network server 20. (See paragraph [0057].) *Zhao's* periodic projection processes keep database 30 in

network server 20 updated or substantially synchronized with the parameters in intelligent device 15A. (See paragraph [0057].) In *Zhao*, the device property table and object property table projection significantly increases the efficiency and speed of data transfer from intelligent devices 15A to network server 20. (See paragraph [0057].)

In contrast to the claimed invention, the object properties and databases in *Zhao* must be periodically updated so that the intelligent device and the network server can maintain communications. In *Zhao*, object properties and databases are used to characterize the intelligent device. Furthermore, in *Zhao*, object properties and databases are used to increase efficiency of data transfer from the intelligent device to the network server. Accordingly, because *Zhao* discloses object properties and databases used to increase efficient data transfer from the intelligent device to the network server, *Zhao* does not disclose retrieving a current value comprises identifying a location of a property from an Extensible Markup Language (XML) map. In other words, *Zhao* does not disclose retrieving a current value by identifying a location of a property from an XML map, because *Zhao* discloses object properties and databases used to increase efficient data transfer.

In short, *Zhao* does not anticipate the claimed invention because *Zhao* at least does not disclose “retrieving the current value of the property, wherein retrieving the current value comprises identifying a location of the property from an Extensible Markup Language (XML) map,” as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claims 9 and 19 each include a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 9, and 19 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of independent Claims 1, 9, and 19.

Dependent Claims 2-8, 10-14, and 20-21 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1, 9, and 19, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1, 9, and 19. Accordingly Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2-8, 10-14, and 20-21.

Regarding Claims 15-18, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Independent Claim 15 at least recites “a computer-readable medium having an extensible markup language data structure stored thereon for use in exposing a property value stored at a server computer to a client computer.” Because *Zhao* merely discloses object properties and databases used to increase efficient data transfer from the intelligent device to the network server, *supra*, *Zhao* does not disclose a computer-readable medium having an extensible markup language data structure. Because *Zhao* discloses object properties and databases used to increase efficient data transfer from the intelligent device to the network server, *Zhao* does not disclose an extensible markup language data structure stored thereon for use in exposing a property value stored at a server computer to a client computer. Accordingly, independent Claim 15 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of independent Claim 15.

Dependent Claims 16-18 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 15, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 15. Accordingly Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 16-18.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Action.


Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and
charge any additional required fees to deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: July 27, 2006

DKS:mdc


D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

